

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

## Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Chief, Operations School

DATE: 30 April 1957

FROM : Acting Chief Instructor, Clandestine  
Services ReviewSUBJECT: Final Course Report -  
Clandestine Services Review No. 16

DOC	15	REV DATE	1-4-80	BY	029725
ORIG COMP	11	OPI	11	TYPE	02
ORIG CLASS	S	PAGES	3	REV CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	AUTH	HR 10-2

1. Thirty-seven students attended the Clandestine Services Review No. 16 which commenced on 8 April and terminated on 25 April 1957. According to the student critiques, the course accomplished its mission as all students felt that a great deal had been done to bring them up-to-date following their return to headquarters. There were no adverse criticisms in this respect.

2. Specific criticisms of the course were as many and varied as the number of students. The only predominant criticism concerned the length of the course which will be dealt with in a succeeding paragraph. Generally, criticisms were leveled at lecturer's delivery and platform techniques, emphasis and de-emphasis of specific subjects and lengths of time devoted to the various categories of subjects. These criticisms were, for the most part, without valid substantiation and represented a rather narrow outlook on the part of the student. However, it is interesting to note the "types" of students that offered the various types of criticism. DD/P personnel of two or three years experience in the DD/P, alone, felt that too much emphasis was given to the overall Agency and DD/I and DD/S, in particular. "Old Hands" in DD/P wished less emphasis on specific DD/P programs (with which they had a long-standing familiarity), auditing, finance and more emphasis placed on the DD/I presentations of world conditions and Soviet capabilities. Although all students had been briefed that the lecturers were chosen for their position and ability to speak of policy and doctrine with authority, many felt they were attending a course in training rather than a briefing and that all lecturers should be the best qualified in platform techniques rather than authorities on the subject at hand. Granted, some presentations were poor, but this was the result of last minute substitutions or unforeseen emergencies resulting in substitutions and which will forever plague a course such as this.

3. As Acting Chief Instructor for the entire running of the course (previous assistance has been limited to two, three or five days at a time) one criticism seems valid. The course appears too long. The content is valid, but asking students to listen and absorb lecture after lecture for approximately seven hours a day for three weeks strains human endurance.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

By the beginning of the third week, interest is visibly lagging so that lecturers in that week are at a distinct disadvantage. Films, open afternoons and other breaks cannot overcome the long hours spent in trying to listen and absorb material being put forth by some seventy different lecturers with as many different approaches and techniques. It is felt that the course can be presented within the period of two weeks without loss of content by using the following approach:

a. The course presents nearly all pertinent rules and regulations as well as organizational concepts in its handbook issued to each student.

b. Lecturers should be briefed that each student will have studied the component or program about which the lecturer will speak so that an explanation of its purpose or description of the organization will be unnecessary. Too many lecturers took too much time to explain the function and organization of their component - many times merely repeating the substance of the authorizing regulation.

c. The course must assume that its students are, by and large, recently returned from a normal two or three year tour although some few will have been away for a longer period. Lecturers should be briefed to discuss the changes that have occurred in the last two or three years regarding their component or program and not to delve into the history since its inception.

d. "Blocks" of lectures on such subjects as EE and SR Programs, PP operations, OO operations, etc. would be better covered by a single individual than using too many specialists or chiefs. It is true that the chief of the activity is in the best position to speak on his specialty, but using such individuals for 30 to 50 minutes and running on four of five in a row is a strain on the recipients attention. Furthermore, the greater the number of guest lecturers, the more inevitable will be the chances of duplication, repetition, etc. Coupling one lecturer with a subject or subjects <sup>covering</sup> only the past two or three years should effect a further saving of time.

e. The most difficult problem in attempting to reduce time and present a compact presentation is the task of briefing each guest lecturer on exactly what is expected of him, what will have been presented prior to and after his presentation in order that repetition and duplication be held to a minimum. However, in view of the success the CSR enjoys in reputation, it is felt that the majority of the guest lecturers will be quite amenable to any suggestions to further improve a course which is of ultimate benefit to them.

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

f. Finally, each guest lecturer should receive a copy of the schedule for EACH running of the course as an added reminder of his position in the schedule in order to minimize repetition and a copy of the student roster.

25X1A9a

4. The administration of the course appeared to be most satisfactory for which [REDACTED] should be commended in carrying out the great bulk of arrangements and details with which the Acting Chief Instructor was completely unfamiliar.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL